

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WE THE PEOPLE,

v.

Case No. 18-mc-51320

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,
UNITED STATES FEDERAL JUDICIARY,
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES SENATE,

HON. AVERN COHN

Defendants.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

I.

Before the Court is a document the Clerk's office filed as "DECLARATION of restoration of the law of the land filed by We the People US Common Law Grand Jury" and designated it as a miscellaneous action. (ECF No. 1). For the reasons that follow, the case will be dismissed.

II.

"[A] district court may, at any time, sua sponte dismiss a complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12 (b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure when the allegations of a complaint are totally implausible, attenuated, unsubstantial, frivolous, devoid of merit, or no longer open to discussion." Apple v. Glenn, et al. 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6th Cir. 1999). A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

When reviewing pro se papers, the court must employ standards less stringent than if the complaint had been drafted by counsel. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). However, federal pleading standards do not permit pro se litigants to proceed on pleadings that are not readily comprehensible. Complaints containing “vague and conclusory allegations” unsupported by material facts are subject to dismissal. Becker v. Ohio State Legal Servs Ass'n, 19 F. App'x 321, 322 (6th Cir. 2001). The Court is also not required to supply the litigant with legal theories or to furnish additional factual allegations—to do so would inappropriately make the court an advocate for the plaintiff. See Thompson v. A.J. Rose Mfg. Co., No. 99-3728, 2000 WL 302998, at *1 (6th Cir. 2000).

III.

The Court has read the document, which consists of 61 pages. It is virtually unintelligible. The plaintiff is identified only as “We the People.” The document has an unreadable signature titled “Jury Foreman Natural Law Tribunal.” Defendants are the United States Supreme Court, United States Federal Judiciary It states the following as causes of action: “Concealment of Natural Courts a/k/a/ Court of Law or Court of Record or common Law Court Tyranny, Subversion, Denial of Due Process, Denial of Habeas Corpus, Felony Rescue, Stacking & Tainting Petit Grand Juries, Stacking & Tainting Grand Juries, Aiding & Abetting enemies both foreign and domestic.” As relief, the plaintiff seeks, among other things, “[t]o impeach and remove ALL judges,” “to legislate law that the Constitution and Civics are to be taught in elementary and high school,” “Congress is to repeal all legislation that subjects the People to government

authority.” Although the documents references the Constitution, Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence, and other official documents, the Court cannot discern a viable or plausible claim or a proper basis for jurisdiction against any of the named defendants. Accordingly, the case is DISMISSED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: 9/25/2019
Detroit, Michigan

S/Avern Cohn
AVERN COHN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE